DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 551 SP 010 189

AUTHOR Goldbecker, Sheralyn S.
TITLE Value Teaching: What Research Says to the Teacher.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 34p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (NEA Stock No. 1039-6-00, No price quoted)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Development; Educational Accountability; Educational History; *Elementary Secondary Education; Ethics; *Moral Development; *Personal Growth; Punishment; School Environment; Self Evaluation; Students; Teachers; *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Values Clarification

ABSTRACT

It is stated in the introduction that growing numbers of educators and researchers are concerned with how students develop values and they are examining strategies for values clarification. This monograph presents historical background and recent trends in value education. It discusses the values clarification approach and the cognitive development approach, considering strategies and criticism for both. The role of the classroom teacher is discussed in relation to (1) accountability, (2) school environment, (3) effect of punishment, (4) the teacher as moral guide, and (5) self knowledge. The monograph contains lists of selected references and additional readings. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

What Research Says to the Teacher

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NEA

TO REPRODUCE OUTSIDE OF THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Values Teaching

by Sheralyn S. Goldbecker

ED124551

SP 010 189

2

A National Education Association Publication

What Research Says to the Teacher

Values Teaching

by Sheralyn S. Goldbecker

nea
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 1976
National Education Association of the United States

Stock No. 1039-6-00

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Goldbecker, Sheralyn S.
Values teaching.
(What research says to the teacher)
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Moral education. 2. Worth. I. Title. II. Series.
LC268.G58 370.11'4 76-9850
ISBN 0-8106-1039-6

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 5

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND 7

RECENT TRENDS 9

VALUES CLARIFICATION APPROACH 11
- Strategies 12
- Criticisms 14

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT APPROACH 15
- Techniques 16
- Criticisms 18

ROLE OF THE CLASSROOM TEACHER 19
- Accountability 19
- School Environment 20
- Effect of Punishment 20
- The Teacher as Moral Guide 21
- Self-Knowledge 21

SELECTED REFERENCES 23

ADDITIONAL READINGS 32

Sheralyn S. Goldbecker, an educational writer and researcher, is the author of *Reading: Instructional Approaches*.

The manuscript was reviewed by Madeline Cahoon, Social Studies Department, Kailua High School, Kailua, Hawaii, and by Michael Silver, formerly a classroom teacher and now a graduate assistant and instructor, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

INTRODUCTION

As growing numbers of educators and researchers become concerned with how students develop *values*—

> . . . ideas as to what is good, beautiful, effective, or just, and therefore worth having, worth doing, or worth striving to attain . . . standards by which we determine if a particular thing . . . is good or bad, desirable or undesirable, worthy or unworthy, or someplace in between these extremes. (39)*
>
> . . . those beliefs, purposes, attitudes, and so on that are chosen freely and thoughtfully, prized, and acted upon. (112)
>
> . . . a prejudice that is consistent with the norms of the prevailing social system. (115)

they are examining strategies for *values clarification*—

> . . . knowing what one prizes, choosing those things which one cares for most, and weaving those things into the fabric of daily living. (125)

Or they look at *morality*—

> . . . conscience, . . . a set of cultural rules of social action which have been internalized by the individual. (72)

and the process of *moral development*—

> . . . increase in internalization of basic cultural rules. (72)

which leads to *moral maturity*—

> . . . the capacity to make decisions and judgments which are moral (that is, based on internal principles) and to act in accordance with such judgments. (72)

And they speak of *moral education*—

> . . . direct and indirect intervention of the school which affects both moral behavior and the capacity to think about issues of right and wrong. (111)

Whether you are concerned with how students develop values or with morality itself, it is apparent that values are essential if you are to deal with those daily situations that require opinions, decisions, and actions—since each decision and each action you make is based, either consciously or unconsciously, on your values and beliefs. Those who are unsure of their values are less equipped to make consistent and effective

*Numbers in parentheses appearing in the text refer to the Selected References beginning on page 23

decisions, and they will be less able to lead satisfying lives. The study and question of values and beliefs should be a part of every subject taught at every grade level, for they are of critical importance to everyone.

The increased concern among educators regarding the development of students' values is the result of a number of factors. Richard K. Jantz and Trudi A. Fulda (64) include among these factors the greater attention today to educatior in the affective domain, the increased research by developmental psychologists, and the concern for the moral condition of society.

Certainly, the latter factor can be seen in the conflict between some adults and young people. There are those adults who claim that drug use, sexual permissiveness, and lack of respect for traditional authority are indications of a lack of a value system and sense of responsibility. There are those young people who see corruption in business and government and reject the traditional structure of moral ideals that allows such conditions to arise and continue to exist. Civil rights violence, the crises of confidence caused by Vietnam and Watergate, the polarization of various social and age groups, and the loss of faith in religious institutions have all contributed to the current moral confusion. More and more people seem to be uncertain about, or even unaware of, their values. And the reasons for this confusion are numerous.

Traditionally, children adopt the values espoused by their parents, but our more mobile way of life, our changing family life-styles and peer-group influences, and our media such as television have exposed students to many different sets of values, some of which cannot help but clash. Because of the wealth of opportunities provided by our society, students are also faced with a growing number of alternatives in their lives, which makes the task of deciding among them even more difficult. The resulting constant need for decision-making and the pressures from adults and peers can lead to a situation such as the one described by William Glasser. (48) While discussing a discipline problem before a group of administrators, teachers, school board members, and parents, a class of sixth graders in the Los Angeles area agreed that it is right and moral to tell the truth. However, they also felt that lying, cheating, and stealing are a "natural part of life in the real world" and that the individual must adapt to this reality in order to survive.

Lawrence Kohlberg (74) and other researchers have found that adult behavior is a more significant factor than religious training or cultural

advantage in a child's moral development. On realizing the hypocrisy of certain adult behaviors, the child either rejects adults and their values or conforms in order to "survive." In the opinion of Joan M. Sayre (116), the youth of today are increasingly disinclined to accept authoritative precepts from adults. Young people tend to question clergy members, teachers, and even parents as they see a discrepancy between the actions and professed beliefs of these adults.

In the face of this situation, many segments of society are turning to the schools as a way of helping students overcome their moral confusion so that they might lead fulfilling lives.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

During the colonial period of our history, schools provided direct religious instruction as an extension of the training received at home. Because this instruction was largely based on the concept of Original Sin, children were believed to know right from wrong from the time of their birth, and, thus, there could be no moral "growth." Immoral behavior was often viewed as deliberate, and dogmatic moral education was designed to "break the will" of the wrongdoer. Conflict between the values taught at school and at home did not usually exist as communities tended to be more or less homogeneous in their beliefs.

With the separation of religion and government by the U.S. Constitution and the beginnings of publicly supported education, schools experienced growing secular conflicts over the teaching of morality. Immigration and industrialization acted to further weaken the role of the school in providing moral education. Marvin J. Taylor (140) views this transitional period as one in which educators tried to teach moral values that were outside of a specific theological context. For example, a class would read the Bible without comment, which provided a "non-denominational morality."

This approach proved unsatisfactory, however, in that it did not quiet objections from outside the schools. Neil Gerard McCluskey, S.J., finds the central problem to be "the limitations inherent in the idea of a *common* school serving a pluralistic society. . . ," and as there became less agreement in society over ultimate values, the schools became less able to present any unified philosophy of values. (89) As society became more heterogeneous in terms of morals, values, religious beliefs, and

life-styles, the schools' emphasis shifted to the relatively safe and non-controversial area of cognitive learning. For John Jarolimek (65), it seemed inevitable that the schools would concern themselves less and less with moral and values education as society became more and more diverse.

Value education was largely downgraded until the writings of John Dewey (31) provided a new rationale for the public schools to emphasize morality and character as part of education. As a result, there was a new sanction for moral training, and in the 1920's and 1930's there was a proliferation of educational programs designed to develop specific character traits—now referred to as the "bag of virtues" approach. These programs were meant to help students internalize selected moral, social, and political imperatives. The teacher became the model for student behavior by representing society's authority and presented a set of rules to be respected and conformed to for its own sake. The students' alternatives were limited to the unquestioned "right" values, and teachers employed reward and punishment, emotional pleas, and appeals to conscience in order to mold behavior. As a result, students gained little experience in learning how to make their own value decisions.

For example, W.W. Charters, in *The Teaching of Ideals*, developed a theory of the character traits and ideals that were considered desirable. To instill them in students, he presented a program of direct and indirect techniques using the school situation, reward and punishment, the role of the teacher, teaching-learning functions, and evaluation strategies. (20)

This method, too, came to be questioned. In the Character Education Study, Hugh Hartshorne and Mark A. May (55) administered 170,000 tests to 11,000 pupils (aged 11 to 16) in an attempt to measure moral knowledge and actual behavior in concrete situations. Among their findings, they reported no positive or consistent correlation between the earliness and amount of training in good moral habits and the students' actual obedience, honesty, etc. In addition, there arose the problems of selecting which "virtues" should be taught and how they should be defined. These problems led to disagreements reminiscent of earlier value education controversies.

Although N.J. Bull (15) feels that the Hartshorne and May study had a stultifying effect on the investigation of the process of moral development, there were efforts in the 1940's and 1950's to continue emphasizing moral and spiritual values in the schools. Two interested groups were the American Council of Education's Committee on Religion and Educa-

tion, and the National Education Association's Educational Policies Commission. There was general agreement that there was a crisis in values education and that the school had some responsibility. However, differences of opinion thwarted the implementation of programs. (140) For Bull, the controversy over values education was due in part to a misconception—that morality and religion were inseparable. The dilemma today in Bull's words is that we are experiencing a "rejection of a vast store of hard-earned moral wisdom, traditionally bound up with religion, but not integral to it." (15)

For Abraham H. Maslow (91), values should be studied from a scientific point of view. He has demonstrated this by relating the nature of values to his heirarchy of needs. His theories have been widely studied and still hold important implications for values teaching today.

RECENT TRENDS

Today educators are still faced with the question of whether to provide value education, and if so, how to go about it. Certainly, there are still objections, some of which are ennumerated by David Purpel and Kevin Ryan: moral education should be provided only in the home and by the church; the schools are not even succeeding in academic areas and thus should not attempt additional programs; teachers are not qualified to teach values; and moral education can easily become indoctrination. (111)

Yet, growing numbers of those concerned with education feel that the school should accept responsibility. After hearing the discussion of sixth graders who found lying to be a necessity, Glasser (48) concluded that when a problem of morality exists in the schools, the schools should not avoid it regardless of the nature of the student's home or church.

Sayre (116), who contends that children learn primarily by imitating models, states that if parents don't teach values standards, then the schools must.

Robert C. Hawley and Isabel L. Hawley (57) believe that teaching values is tantamount to teaching survival skills for if people do not learn to live cooperatively, i.e., governed by moral beliefs, then they will ultimately destroy themselves.

Kohlberg agrees with the findings of Hartshorne and May (55) that conventional character education programs in churches and schools have

little effect on students' moral conduct. However, Kohlberg does believe that the teacher and the school in an everyday context have "a very considerable impact upon the child's moral development." (72) Teachers do moralize in class, and outside the home, teachers are the student's most important model for moral reasoning. Kohlberg and Robert L. Selman (78) maintain that the teacher can't help but provide moral education as teachers constantly evaluate students' behavior. Although teachers are not always aware of this, students usually are.

There is a growing attempt by educators and those in complementary fields to explain and remedy the failures of the earlier value education programs. These failures are evidenced by the lack of correspondence in youths between their professed beliefs and their actual behavior as well as their disinclination to develop value decision-making skills and then assume responsibility for their decisions. Hawley and Hawley (57) have concluded that this lack of correspondence has accounted for much of the personal dissatisfaction, anxiety, and apparent apathy in their lives. Consequently, recent research on children's morality has focused on the internalization of values. Reginald D. Archambault (3) believes that in order to bridge the gap between belief and action, one must employ an act of will—that intellectual understanding and support of any given norm of behavior is not enough.

Michael Scriven (118) divides into three categories those people who are seeking solutions to the values education problem:

1. The affectivists who believe that moral education should emphasize feeling, affect, and attitude, using techniques such as role-playing and the presentation of adult models. For them, it is the area of affect which links one's knowledge of rules to one's behavior.

2. The developmentalists who believe in the moral developmental stages of the child. Therefore, no single treatment of a moral problem can have any consequence on a group of students if the likely possibility is true that different members of the group are on different levels of moral reasoning.

3. The cognitivists who believe that a curriculum which provides moral reasoning and analysis skills should be emphasized over the affective aspects of moral education.

The two most prominent approaches to values education today are combinations of Scriven's three categories. Those emphasizing values clarification are affectivist-cognitivists, while those following the theory of stages of moral development are developmentalist-cognitivists.

VALUES CLARIFICATION APPROACH

This technique had its origin in the work of Louis Raths in the late 1950's. (112) He offers seven stages of valuing. They are for the teacher to use in helping the students learn how to make choices freely while keeping an open mind to alternative but consistent possibilities. The most distinguishing characteristic of values clarification is its emphasis on affective learning. Above all, its practioneers believe that a valuing process can be taught.

Sidney B. Simon and Polly deSherbinnin see our society as dynamic rather than as unchanging. For this reason they consider it wiser to focus upon the process of valuing rather than upon any particular values. (127) For Simon and deSherbinnin (125), the specific aims of values clarification are to help people become more purposeful and productive by sharpening their critical thinking so that they will become less vulnerable and be able to develop better interpersonal relationships.

R. F. Peck and R. J. Havighurst (105) describe a study in how values are learned. Their study was carried out in the Midwestern "Prairie City" with children aged 10 to 17. Primarily concerned with motivation and emotional aspects, rather than cognition, the researchers tested inner attitude instead of actual conduct. In viewing the problem from the affective perspective, the individual character was clearly evident—in contrast to the findings of Hartshorne and May (55), and even the individual inconsistencies of character appeared to maintain a consistent pattern.

Bull (15) has conducted research into the association between moral judgment and the four key variables of socio-economic background, religion, sex, and intelligence (as well as the home and familial discipline). After administering visual projection and written tests and interviewing 360 students, aged 7 to 17, Bull found that intelligence is the most significant variable, followed by socio-economic class, with religion playing the least important role. However, for Bull, moral judgment is not entirely cognitive, for he feels that there is a crucial "emotional variable" in the learning process which is the key to motivation. Jarolimek (65) feels that this neglect of the affective domain in values education and overemphasis on the cognitive is a "serious shortcoming of American education today."

As for the question of whether one can teach values, many say YES—whether taught separately or combined with other courses of study. (18, 33, 34, 53, 57, 122, 143)

Strategies

As part of giving students an opportunity to consider alternatives and make choices, Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum (127) have developed 79 varied classroom strategies—both one-time exercises as well as those to be used repeatedly. An important part of helping students become aware of their own beliefs in order to bring their actions into line with them is the public affirmation of one's values. Such opportunities are provided through "values voting" on specific issues (creating an awareness so that others see issues differently) and "rank ordering" (whereby students gain experience in choosing among alternatives and explaining why they rank their choices as they do). Other strategies employed by the authors are value sheets, values clarification discussions, role-playing, and interviews.

These activities have been used in drug education as an alternative to scare tactics. A study of 851 students, grades 5 through 10, has revealed that after values clarification, the students significantly reduced their use of drugs. Other studies have reported that fifth graders who participated in values clarification activities "developed a more favorable attitude toward themselves and felt more positive about themselves than did their classmates"; and that another group of fifth graders who had continually misbehaved took a greater part in values clarification activities than in the regular curriculum and became quieter and better behaved. (125)

Another important strategy is the use of adult models to promote values clarification. According to Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum (127), teachers should present themselves as models and express their values along with their students, without dominating the discussion.

Jarolimek (65) finds adult models outside the home more crucial for values education than ever before because current family life-styles tend to segregate children from adults. Values education is closely related to socialization because socialization skills are learned early in life from significant adults who model these roles for the learner. Jarolimek believes that removing adult influences deprives students of a means of becoming socialized. While students can learn social skills from their

peers, they will not internalize adult values at school unless there is extended, close contact with adults representing various ages, sexes, and occupational roles. Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum (127) caution us, however, that students today often have too many models to emulate, which can also frustrate the mature development of values.

Jack R. Fraenkel (38) recommends the value-incident as a strategy to help students become aware of their own and others' values. Such an incident can be presented through a story or novel, film, picture, etc. Afterwards, the students discuss, first, what the characters are doing or saying and their underlying reasons, and, second, what they themselves would do in that situation. Thus, by making inferences about what they and others feel is important, students will begin to think about what they value.

Another variation of this strategy involves a values-incident in which the characters must choose between two or more conflicting alternatives. Students discuss each option and its consequences for both the characters and others, and relate their feelings on what the characters should do to their own behavior in similar situations. The teacher's role is to help students evaluate the various courses of action and examine the nature of their consequences. In this way, students should learn to identify and empathize with the person in conflict. As a result, they will come to realize that values can conflict and that there are many ways of handling conflict. They should also learn to respect others by becoming aware of the similarities and differences of people's feelings and why they behave as they do. An important object of this strategy is to teach students that a particular action is not intrinsically good or bad but "depends on the circumstances under which it occurs and the degree to which the action, *under those circumstances and in that situation,* is just." (38)

J. Doyle Casteel and Robert J. Stahl (18) find that values clarification helps students to communicate their beliefs, to empathize with others, and to make decisions within a social setting based on consistent beliefs. To encourage this process, they have developed "value sheets" as a curriculum aid.

Believing that good moral values and character education must be taught and that children learn primarily through the imitation of models, Sayre (116) has developed a kit—"Teaching Moral Values Through Behavior Modification"—that presents 21 situations through open-ended stories and pictures on such topics as personal ethics, individual

and group responsibility, and respect for various types of authority. The kit is intended to stimulate role-playing among students as a strategy for developing values.

Hawley and Hawley (57) propose a wide variety of role-playing—along with values voting, ranking, forced choice situations, and value-related situations to react to—for promoting values clarification. The three steps for the teacher to complete are: (1.) the stimulation of thinking about a value-related area and sharing of thoughts, (2.) the encouragement of non-judgmental acceptance of shared thoughts, and (3.) the stimulation of additional reflection on attitudes as the student moves toward a more comprehensive way of valuing.

The final strategy to be reviewed here was developed by Robert E. Samples. (115) Using the term *value-prejudice* in place of *value* (see the "Introduction" of this report, page 5), Samples focused on intrinsic rather than extrinsic value-prejudices, finding that individuals maintain their known value-prejudices by conscious choice: "The individual is the instrumental factor in value acquisition and retention, rather than the social system."

Samples' research with teachers in more than a dozen large-city school districts indicated that nearly all their decisions were based on emotion and intuition rather than on logic and rationality. By providing the teachers with strategies to help them fully sense emotions before making decisions, Samples finds the teachers had a better understanding of a particular value-prejudice and had become more sensitive to the emotions that activate their value structures. By checking the source of each emotion, speaking only in the first person, and avoiding scapegoating, Samples believes that people can gain an awareness of their own value-prejudice fields and can, thereby, develop an intrinsic core personality, accepting and internalizing responsibility for their own value-prejudices, rather than being extrinsically motivated and oriented.

Criticisms

One of the critics of the values clarification approach is John S. Stewart (133), who states that values clarification is based on a methodology which reflects the values of its creators and is, therefore, not value free as claimed. Furthermore, for Stewart, their values are frequently in conflict.

Stewart believes that values clarification deals primarily with the content of values—and to a lesser extent with the process of valuing—but ignores the structure of values and valuing, which for him is more important. He also points out that though the values clarification advocates claim that values are personal, situational, individually derived, and relative, many of them offer lists of "undesirable" value-based behaviors that their approach can cure. Finally, he contends that strategies which call for public affirmation of values leave the student unnecessarily open to peer pressure—if not condemnation.

Another recent critic of values clarification is Alan Lockwood. Lockwood (87) cites three problem areas in values clarification: (1) the definition and theory of values clarification, (2) the characterization of values clarification as a treatment process much like client-centered therapy that treats emotional needs rather than value needs, and (3) the tendancy of values clarification to teach ethical relativism to children by presenting all values as equally valid. Lockwood has also argued that values clarification violates the personal rights of children, especially in some of the intimate questions asked to children.

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

The theory that children progress through a series of moral stages has a basis in the writing of John Dewey. (31) To neglect which moral stage the child is in can result in the child's giving "a mechanical imitation of moral conduct, but the imitation will be ethically dead, because it is external and has its centre without, not within, the individual."

Jean Piaget (109) who developed the theory of cognitive stages of development, found that children underwent two moral stages—"morality of constraint" (blind obedience to authority) and "morality of cooperation" (obedience out of cooperation and understanding).

In recent years, Kohlberg has developed and refined his theory of the stages of moral development. His typological scheme is the result of 12 years of study of 75 boys, ages 10 to 16, in North America, Great Britain, Taiwan, and Turkey. (70) For Kohlberg the child who is unable to judge right from wrong in terms of rules and authority is "premoral." "Preconventional morality" is when one acts out of an awareness of the consequences of one's actions and the physical power of authority.

"Conventional morality" involves the consideration of others and loyalty to the *status quo*. "Post-conventional morality" entails moral values and principles with a validity beyond the authority of the group, i.e., "universal" principles. Within each of these levels, Kohlberg differentiates various stages of moral development.

According to Kohlberg, moral and intellectual development cannot be separated. The same stages are experienced by everyone, although at different rates of growth, as an individual's thinking about morality matures into a more rational system of reasoning about moral conflicts. No stage can be skipped or taken out of order, and an individual can be "frozen" at any stage.

Using the theories of Piaget and Kohlberg, Jantz and Fulda (64) have postulated two levels of moral thinking in elementary school students: the "morality of restraint" which is egocentric in nature, and the "morality of participation" characterized by increased respect and sympathy for peers. They stress that teachers must provide the student with decision-making opportunities based on realistic assessments of the level of moral thinking or judgment possible for the student. Recognizing these levels will make the formulation of educational goals and objectives easier, and will facilitate the aim of moral education in the schools—to help the student move gradually to higher stages of moral development.

The primary characteristic of the cognitive development approach is that educators can stimulate but not teach internalized principles of moral judgment (78) and that educators should do this in accordance with the stages of moral development. (72)

Techniques

Although Kohlberg and Selman (78) feel that the problems of moral education actually come to the classroom teacher as behavior problems and not as curriculum problems which could be worked out in the abstract, a number of techniques to stimulate moral development have been devised. Kohlberg (72) is not offering specific, "how-to" advice; however, he does feel that social scientists can assist students in the clarification of values without imposing their own.

Kohlberg and Selman (78) state that students who regularly discuss moral dilemmas articulate reasoning at higher stages; thus, the exchange of reasoning through group discussions stimulates moral growth. Among

the ingredients Kohlberg and Selman find necessary for successful discussions are: a recognized moral dilemma, a discussion leader to keep the focus on moral reasoning, and a classroom environment conducive to the free expression of individual reasoning. Moral thought is then stimulated by placing the child in a situation of uncertainty or conflict, with the teacher remaining neutral or acting as a moral guide but not as an enforcer. By this method the students will take an active part in their own mental growth, rather than remaining passive recipients of external teaching.

As reported by Ronald E. Galbraith and Thomas H. Jones (43), staff members of the Social Studies Curriculum Center at Carnegie-Mellon University have developed a discussion-oriented teaching plan applying Kohlberg's principles. (44) First, a real conflict involving a number of moral issues is presented through readings, films, role-playing, etc., and the students are asked what the characters should do. If this does not create a controversy among the students, then an alternative dilemma involving the same story, characters, and moral issues, but with a change in the situation, can be provided. Probe questions are used to stimulate further reasoning on the moral problems of the dilemma and to focus on specific issues.

Testing a media approach with 28 second graders to see if a sound filmstrip presentation and discussion could bring about a significant change in moral level, Selman and Marcus Lieberman (121) constructed suitable dramatic dilemmas involving conflict between two or more understood values. The situations were open-ended so that children could debate the right course of action and give possible reasons for such behavior (at various levels of moral reasoning). In using dilemmas, it was also thought that most students would be stimulated by a higher level of reasoning. Selman and Lieberman discovered that dilemmas in such areas as truth, promises, and sharing encourage students to separate extraneous issues (e.g., punishment) from moral reasoning and, thereby, help them formulate reasons for moral choices.

Value analysis, as described by Jerrold R. Coombs (24), is a procedure to help students make more rational decisions about value issues and to help them resolve their own value conflicts. Coombs and Meux (25) describe how individual students can do this by analyzing a value. The steps include identifying the value, examining the facts about it, and applying the value to life situations to see if it's an acceptable one or not. James Chadwick and Meux (19) describe a value analysis procedure for a

class to follow as a group. They conducted a workshop with 15 early-elementary through secondary teachers and found their value analysis procedures adaptable to elementary instruction and other subject areas. Chadwick and Meux also found that value analysis facilitates individualization of instruction, results in greater understanding and group discussion participation, and increases student motivation and enthusiasm.

Other research of interest to the classroom teacher is by Donald Oliver and James P. Shaver (102) and Fred M. Newmann. (100)

Criticisms

Bull (15) believes that Piaget overemphasizes the cognitive aspects of moral judgment and, as a result, ignores the cognitive. For Bull, Piaget is concerned with the middle stages of moral development (rules by others and by reciprocity) to the exclusion of the "premorality" and "final, autonomous" (or internal) morality stages.

Richard S. Peters (107) points out that Kohlberg does not appreciate that students learn moral rules in the face of counter-inclinations; because they do, Peters believes that students need models and reinforcements. He considered Kohlberg "weak" on the affective aspects of moral judgment, e.g., moral emotions like guilt and concern for others.

Justin Aronfreed (4) proposes that social experiences can be translated into internal controls that result in moral behavior. Children may induce the "fundamental properties of moral thought" as a result of their own social experiences, independently from the chronological stages in their moral development. For Aronfreed, then, it is the affective dimensions of a situation that control one's moral behavior.

Norma K. Stone (134) points out an inconsistency in Kohlberg's thinking that concerns Peters. (106) Kohlberg (as well as Piaget) posits that children's moral growth can be independent from adult instruction. Yet both acknowledge the influence environment plays, in which adults as teachers have an important role. Kohlberg recognizes the importance of cognitive stimulation on a child's development from one moral stage to another but does not recognize the influence of teaching to abet the child's moral growth.

Finally, two research reviews of Kohlberg's model of moral development have raised some serious questions about his theory. These reviews tend to indicate that Kohlberg's model is neither the best explanation of

moral development nor is it so strongly supported by empirical evidence that it should be the basis for a curriculum. Elizabeth Simpson (128) has stated that Kohlberg lacks the data to claim for the universality of his theory. She concludes that the theory is generally ethnocentric; that is, the stage definitions and assumptions underlying them are culturally biased. William Kurtines and Ester Blank Greif (84) have also questioned the sample used to establish the universality of Kohlberg's theory. In their evaluation, Kurtines and Greif found Kohlberg's measuring instrument lacking in areas related to its derivation, administration, and scoring. More specifically, they criticize Kohlberg's measuring device for the lack of evidence of its reliability and validity.

ROLE OF THE CLASSROOM TEACHER

Accountability

Walter N. Gantt (45) introduces accountability into value education. He contends that if the school is to take the responsibility for teaching students how to make value decisions, the school must have conditions that will enable the teacher to bring about this moral development. He further contends that the role, rights, and responsibilities of the teacher must be stated; that the teacher must have the academic freedom to discuss controversial issues and use learning materials appropriate to the students' levels; and that for teaching strategies to be effective, they must be related to the levels of the students. Finally, he maintains that there should be preservice and in-service training for the teacher.

Gantt's system of accountability involves everyone in society who is concerned with education—students, teachers, other curriculum workers, and laypersons. Only when all these people are involved can the teacher then be obliged to accept accountability. His system would include their consensus on goals, their knowledge of what will be assessed and how, their detailed identification of strategies to stimulate achievement, and their knowledge of criteria used to determine progress toward the goals.

Archambault (3), on the other hand, seems to reject entirely the idea of any ultimate, long-range accountability in value education in which success has been demonstrated. For Archambault, if the student in later life does not demonstrate moral behavior, the fault lies not with the school but rather with a "failure of will" in the student.

School Environment

Certainly one of the continuing themes of past and present investigations in the area of moral education is the importance of the school environment. Hartshorne and May (55) and Kohlberg and Selman (78) found the creation of just schools as a prerequisite for the instruction of justice, which is the goal of mature moral reasoning.

Glasser (48) finds it essential that students be able to discuss moral issues openly and honestly in a non-punitive, non-threatening environment. Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum (127) concur that the teacher must provide a classroom situation where students will feel free to share ideas. And Hawley and Hawley (57) advocate an atmosphere of warmth and security that encourages creative thinking on the part of the students.

Effect of Punishment

Punishment generally seems to have little effect on moral development. While the moral behavior of children in the earlier of Kohlberg's seven developmental stages may be inspired by fear, Kohlberg finds that as children get older, moral behavior is motivated more by moral beliefs than by fear of punishment. In short, he concludes, as did Hartshorne and May (55), that punishment may produce short-term conformity in specific situations but will not result in internalized moral habits. (72) Kohlberg also develops this point with Selman as they contend that a system of rewards and punishments does not lead to moral development and does not appear to produce long-range or positive results. (78)

In a cross-cultural study in the United States, Europe, and Asia described by June L. Tapp (139), Robert Hess and Leigh Minturn with field teams conducted tests and interviews with 5,000 children, aged 10 to 14, regarding compliance with laws. Knowing that Kohlberg considers this to be a crucial age period in moral development, Hess and others considered it significant that the children's answers focused on the content and purpose of the rules and not on the punishment and authority connected to them. Hess and others also found that those adults closest to the children in their personal lives, e.g., parents, were most able to nuture compliance on the part of the children. Those adults not as close, e.g., policemen, were more limited to coercion which was found not as effective as persuasion in the development of moral conformity and independence.

Glasser (43) has found that children would readily lie to avoid punishment and they see punishment as part of the luck of the game—once they have paid the price, they are free to lie again. "The children were also clear in their belief that, as long as we rely upon punishment, we will sow the seeds of lying, cheating, and blackmail."

The Teacher as Moral Guide

Naturally, teachers must avoid any type of indoctrination or imposition of their values upon the students. Rather, they must listen closely to what the students are saying, express confidence in them, and show a sincere interest in their opinions. As Kohlberg (72) points out, traditional terms to describe moral character are merely external value judgments that are useless in understanding a child's behavior. Rather, a teacher must make an effort to understand children's conduct in terms of their needs, the values of their peer group, and the demands of the situation they are in.

In order to maintain the focus on a value situation under discussion and to encourage a free exchange of ideas, teachers should participate in, but not dominate, the discussion. Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum (127) suggest that the teacher share her or his own views only toward the end of a discussion so as to appear to be a person with values, a model, and yet not appear to be someone whose values have greater weight or validity than those of the students.

Raths, Harmin, and Simon (112) see the role of the teacher as a facilitator who takes a cue from the difficulties of the students, rather than as someone who just "puts things into the mind of the child."

However, Gantt (45) cautions that if the teacher helps the students to learn how but not what to think, the teacher may find that they don't always make the "right" decisions.

Self-Knowledge

That teachers must have a knowledge of their own attitudes, in addition to training in value education strategies, is emphasized by a number of writers, including Kohlberg and Selman. (78)

As a way of helping teachers gain the necessary self-knowledge, James A. Bellanca (10) has developed a workbook to assist the teacher in

becoming a learning facilitator. Topics including identity, assessing needs, questioning beliefs, making decisions, setting goals, and evaluating are dealt with through behavior checklists, self-evaluations, goal-ranking, thought-process assessment, social role analysis, expression of feelings, and other techniques. The goal for Bellanca is the ability to direct one's own learning by gaining a self-knowledge of one's attitudes and values. As a result of this examination of the interrelationships among valuing, thinking, and feeling, the teacher should become a self-directed change agent.

Purpel and Ryan (111) feel that for teachers and students alike, the goal of moral development is a continuing process—a goal that goes far beyond any preservice and in-service education in values education. As professionals, teachers concerned with their own moral development will realize that they are involved with their students in a mutual quest for moral insight. This is the challenge in values teaching.

SELECTED REFERENCES

1. Allinsmith, W. "Moral Standards: The Learning of Moral Standards." *Inner Conflict and Defense*. (Edited by D. R. Miller and G. G. Swainson.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
2. Alston, W. P. "Comments on Kohlberg's 'From Is to Ought.' " *Cognitive Development and Epistemology*. (Edited by T. Mischel.) New York: Academic Press, 1971.
3. Archambault, Reginald D. "Criteria for Success in Moral Instruction." *Moral Education*. (Edited by Barry I. Chazan and Jonas F. Soltis.) New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973. pp. 159-169.
4. Aronfreed, Justin. "Affective and Cognitive Mechanisms in the Internalized Control of Social Behavior." *The Acquisition and Development of Values: Perspectives on Research*. Report of a Conference, May 15-17, 1968, Washington, D.C. Bethesda, Md.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, n.d.
5. Atkinson, R. F. "Instruction and Indoctrination." *Philosophical Analysis and Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.
6. Baier, Kurt, and Rescher, Nicholas, editors. *Values and the Future: The Impact of Technological Change on American Values*. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
7. Bandura, A. "Influence of Models' Reinforcement Contingencies on the Acquisitions of Imitative Responses." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1:589-95; 1965.
8. _____, and McDonald, F. J. "The Influence of Social Reinforcement and the Behavior of Models in Shaping Children's Moral Judgment." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67:274-81; 1963.
9. Beck, C. M., and others, editors. *Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
10. Bellanca, James A. *Values and the Search for Self*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.
11. Berkowitz, L. *Development of Motives and Values in the Child*. New York: Basic Books, 1964.
12. Blatt, M., and Kohlberg, L. "The Effects of Classroom Moral Discussion Upon Children's Level of Moral Judgment." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, September 1970.
13. Bradburn, E. "Children's Moral Knowledge." *Educational Research* 9; 1967.
14. Brown, Nina W. "Teaching How To Be Parents: Why Not?" *Character Education Journal* 2:12-13; Winter 1973.

15. Bull, N. J. *Moral Judgment from Childhood to Adolescence*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1969.
16. Carbone, Peter F., Jr. "Reflections on Moral Education." *The Record* 71:598-607; May 1970.
17. Carr, D. B., and Willenberg, E. P. *Teaching Children Values*. Freeport, N.Y.: Honor Your Partner Records, 1966.
18. Casteel, J. Doyle, and Stahl, Robert J. *Value Clarification in the Classroom: A Primer*. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1975.
19. Chadwick, James, and Meux, Milton. "Procedures for Value Analysis." *Values Education: Rationale, Strategies, and Procedures*. (Edited by Lawrence E. Metcalf.) 41st Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971. pp. 75-119.
20. Charters, W. W. *The Teaching of Ideals*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.
21. Chazan, Barry I., and Soltis, Jonas F., editors. *Moral Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973.
22. Clausen, John A., editor. *Socialization and Society*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1968.
23. Collier, Gerald; Tomlinson, Peter; and Wilson, John, editors. *Values and Moral Development in Higher Education*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.
24. Coombs, Jerrold R. "Objectives of Value Analysis." *Values Education: Rationale, Strategies, and Procedures*. (Edited by Lawrence E. Metcalf.) 41st Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971. pp. 1-28.
25. _____, and Meux, Milton. "Teaching Strategies for Value Analysis." *Values Education: Rationale, Strategies, and Procedures*. (Edited by Lawrence E. Metcalf.) 41st Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971. pp. 29-74.
26. Counts, George S. "Should the Teacher Always Be Neutral?" *Phi Delta Kappan* 51:188; December 1969.
27. Crittenden, Brian. "A Comment on Cognitive Moral Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 56:695-96; June 1975.
28. Crowley, P. M. "Effect of Training Upon Objectivity of Moral Judgment in Grade-School Children." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 8:228-33; 1968.
29. Curwin, Richard L. and Curwin, Geri. *Developing Individual Values in the Classroom*. Palo Alto, California: Learning Handbooks, 1974.
30. Dahlke, H. Otto. *Values in Culture and Classroom: A Study in the Sociology of the School*. Harper's Social Science Series. (Edited by F. Stuart

Chapin.) New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958.
31. Dewey, John. *Moral Principles in Education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909.
32. _____. *The Philosophy of John Dewey*. (Edited by J. Ratner.) New York: Modern Library, 1939.
33. Duffey, Robert V. "Moral Education and the Study of Current Events." *Social Education* 39:33-35; January 1975.
34. Dunfee, Maxine. *Teaching for Social Values in Social Studies*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Childhood Education International, 1974.
35. Durkheim, Emile. *Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education*. (Translated by Everett K. Wilson and Herman Schnurer.) New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.
36. Duska, Ronald and Whelan, Mariellen. *Moral Development: A Guide to Piaget and Kohlberg*. New York: Paulist Press, 1975.
37. Ezer, Melvin. "Value Teaching in the Middle and Upper Grades: A Rationale for Teaching But Not Transmitting Values." *Social Education* 31:39-40; January 1967.
38. Fraenkel, Jack R. *Helping Students Think and Value*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
39. _____. "Strategies for Developing Values." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.
40. Frankena, William K. "Toward a Philosophy of Moral Education." *Moral Education*. (Edited by Barry I. Chazan and Jonas F. Soltis.) New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973. pp. 148-58.
41. Friedenberg, E. Z. "New Value Conflicts in American Education." *School Review* 74; 1966.
42. Galbraith, Ronald E. and Jones, Thomas M. *Moral Reasoning: Teaching Strategies for Adapting Kohlberg to the Classroom*. Anoka, Minnesota: Greenhaven Press, 1976.
43. _____. "Teaching Strategies for Moral Dilemmas: An Application of Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development to the Social Studies Classroom." *Social Education* 39:16-22; January 1975.
44. Galbraith, Ronald E., and Soues, Thomas M. *Moral Reasoning: Teaching Strategies for Adapting Kohlberg to the Classroom*. Anoka, Minn.: Greenhaven Press, 1976.
45. Gantt, Walter N. "Teacher Accountability for Moral Education." *Social Education* 39:29-32; January 1975.
46. Getzels, Jacob W. "The Acquisition of Values in School and Society." *The High School in a New Era*. (Edited by Francis S. Chase and Harold A. Anderson.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. pp. 146-61.

47. Glassco, J. A., and others. "Stability of Training Effects on Intentionality in Moral Judgment in Children." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 14:360-65; 1970.
48. Glasser, William. *Schools Without Failure*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1969.
49. Grainger, A. J. *The Bullring: A Classroom in Moral Education*. Oxford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press, 1970.
50. Gustafson, J., and others, editors. *Moral Education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.
51. Hall, Brian P. *Value Clarification as Learning Process: A Sourcebook*. New York: Paulist Press, 1973.
52. Hall, Robert and Davis, John. *Moral Education in Theory and Practice*. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1975.
53. Harmin, Merrill, and others. *Clarifying Values Through Subject Matter: Applications for the Classroom*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.
54. Hartmann, H. *Psychoanalysis and Moral Values*. New York: International University Press, 1960.
55. Hartshorne, Hugh, and May, Mark A. *Studies in the Nature of Character:* Vol. I, Studies in Deceit; Vol. II, Studies in Self-Control; Vol. III, Studies in the Organization of Character. New York: Macmillan, 1928-1930.
56. Hawley, Robert C. *Value Exploration Through Role Playing*. New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc., 1974.
57. _____, and Hawley, Isabel L. *Human Values in the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers*. New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc., 1975.
58. Hearn, D. Dwain, editor. *Values, Feelings and Morals: Part I–Research and Perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators, 1974.
59. Hewitt, Thomas W., and Pratt, Gerald B. "Using the Character Education Curriculum." *Character Education Journal* 2:10-11; Winter 1973.
60. Hoffman, M. L. "Moral Development." *Carmichael's Manual of Psychology*. Vol. 2. 3rd edition. (Edited by P. H. Mussen.) New York: John Wiley, 1970.
61. _____, and Saltzstein, H. "Parent Discipline and the Child's Moral Development." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 5:45-57; 1967.
62. Hogan, Robert. *Moral Conduct and Moral Character: A Psychological Perspective*. (U.S. Office of Education Project No. R16J3C, Report No. 129) Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, 1972.
63. Howe, Leland W. *Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond*. New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc., 1975.
64. Jantz, Richard K., and Fulda, Trudi A. "The Role of Moral Education in the Public Elementary School." *Social Education* 39:24-28; January 1975.

65. Jarolimek, John. "But Who Bends the Twig?" *Character Education Journal* 2:14-15, 23-24; Winter 1973.
66. Jensen, L. C. and Larm, C. "Effect of Two Training Procedures on Intentionality in Moral Judgments Among Children." *Developmental Psychology* 2; 1970.
67. Johnson, R. C. "A Study of Children's Moral Judgments." *Child Development* 33:327-54; 1962.
68. Kay, W. *Moral Development: A Psychological Study of Moral Growth from Childhood to Adolescence*. New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1968.
69. Keniston, K. "Student Activism, Moral Development and Morality. *American Journal of Orthopsychology* 40:577-92; 1970.
70. Kohlberg, Lawrence. "The Child as a Moral Philosopher." *Psychology Today* 7:25-30; 1968.
71. _____. "A Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education." *The Humanist* 32:13-16; 1972.
72. _____. "Development of Moral Character and Moral Ideology." *Review of Child Development Research*. Vol. I. (Edited by Martin L. Hoffman and Lois Wladis Hoffman.) New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964. pp. 383-431.
73. _____. "From Is to Ought: How to Commit the Naturalistic Fallacy and Get Away with It in the Study of Moral Development." *Cognitive Development and Epistemology*. (Edited by T. Mischel.) New York: Academic Press, 1971.
74. _____. "Moral Development and Education of Adolescents." *Adolescents and the American High School*. (Edited by Richard Purnell.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970. pp. 144-62.
75. _____. "Moral Development and the New Social Studies." *Social Education* 5:369-75; May 1973.
76. _____. *Stages in the Development of Moral Thought and Action*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
77. _____ with Whitten, P. "Understanding the Hidden Curriculum." *Learning* 1:10-14; 1972.
78. _____, and Selman, Robert L. *Preparing School Personnel Relative to Values: A Look at Moral Education in the Schools*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1972.
79. _____, and Turiel, Elliot. "Moral Development and Moral Education." *Psychology and Educational Practice*. (Edited by G. Lesser.) Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1971. pp. 410-65.
80. _____, editors. *Recent Research in Moral Development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.
81. Lamprecht, Lynn. "Instructional Media." *Law in American Society* 2:40-42; May 1973.
82. Lee, Lee C. "Children's Understanding of Morals." *Values, Feelings and*

Morals: Part I–Research and Perspectives. (Edited by D. Dwain Hearn.) Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators, 1974. pp. 19-38.

83. _____. "The Concomitant Development of Cognitive and Moral Modes of Thought: A Test of Selected Deductions from Piaget's Theory." *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 83:93-146; 1971.
84. Kurtines, William, and Greif, Ester Blank. "The Development of Moral Thought: Review and Evaluation of Kohlberg's Approach." *Psychological Bulletin* 81:453-70; 1974.
85. Leeper, Robert R., editor. *Emerging Moral Dimensions in Society: Implications for Schooling*. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.
86. Lickona, T. "Piaget Misunderstood: A Critique of the Criticisms of His Theory of Moral Development." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 15:337-50; October 1969.
87. Lockwood, Alan. "A Critical View of Values Clarification." *Teachers College Record:* 35-50; Oct. 1975.
88. Loubser, J. J. "The Contribution of School to Moral Development: A Working Paper in the Theory of Action." *Interchange* 1; 1970.
89. McCluskey, Neil Gerard, S. J. *Public Schools and Moral Education: The Influence of Horace Mann, William Torrey Harris and John Dewey*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.
90. Mackey, James A. "Moral Insight in the Classroom." *The Elementary School Journal* 73:233-38; February 1973.
91. Maslow, Abraham H. *Motivation and Personality*. N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1954.
92. Massialas, Byron, and Zevin, Jack. *Creative Encounters in the Classroom*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.
93. Mattox, Beverly A. *Getting It Together: Dilemmas for the Classroom*. San Diego: Pennant Press, 1975.
94. Medinnus, G. R. "Moral Development in Childhood: Lying." *Psychological Studies of Human Development*. (Edited by Raymond G. Kuhlen and George G. Thompson.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
95. Metcalf, Lawrence E., editor. *Values Education: Rationale, Strategies, and Procedures*. 41st Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971.
96. Meux, Milton. "Resolving Value Conflicts." *Values Education: Rationale, Strategies, and Procedures*. (Edited by Lawrence E. Metcalf.) 41st Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971. pp. 120-66.
97. Meyer, John; Burnham, Brian; and Cholvat, John. *Values Education: Theory, Problems, Prospects*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975.

98. National College of Education. *Value Sharing*. Evanston, Ill.: the College, 1969.
99. Nelson, Jack L., editor. *Hayden American Values Series: Challenges and Choices*. Rochelle Park, N.J.: Hayden Book Company, Inc.
100. Newmann, Fred M. (with the assistance of Donald Oliver). *Clarifying Public Controversy: An Approach to Teaching Social Studies*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1970.
101. Nicholson, Sandy. *Values, Feelings and Morals: Part II–An Annotated Bibliography of Programs and Instructional Materials*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators, 1974.
102. Oliver, Donald, and Shaver, James P. *Teaching Public Issues in the High School*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
103. Overly, N. V., editor. *The Unstudied Curriculum: Its Impact on Children*. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1970.
104. Paulson, Wayne. *Deciding for Myself: A Values Clarification Series*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1974.
105. Peck, R. F., and Havighurst, R. J. *The Psychology of Character Development*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1960.
106. Peters, Richard S. "Moral Development: A Plea for Pluralism." *Cognitive Development and Epistemology*. (Edited by T. Mischel.) New York: Academic Press, 1971.
107. _____. "A Reply to Kohlberg." *Phi Delta Kappan* 56:678; June 1975.
108. Piaget, Jean. *The Moral Development of the Child*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1932.
109. _____. *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
110. Pittel, S. M., and Mendelsohn, G. A. "Measurement of Moral Values." *Psychological Bulletin* 66:22-35, 1966.
111. Purpel, David, and Ryan, Kevin. "Moral Education: Where Sages Fear To Tread." *Phi Delta Kappan* 56:659-62; June 1975.
112. Raths, Louis; Harmin, Merrill; and Simon, Sidney. *Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.
113. Rich, John Martin. *Education and Human Values*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
114. Rokeach, Milton. *Beliefs, Attitude and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1968.
115. Samples, Robert E. "Value-Prejudice: Toward a Personal Awareness." *Law in American Society* 3:32-36; November 1974.
116. Sayre, Joan M. "Teaching Moral Values Through Behavior Modifica-

tion." *Character Education Journal* 2:2-3, 25; Winter 1973.
117. Schrank, Jeffrey. *Teaching Human Beings: 101 Subversive Activities for the Classroom*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.
118. Scriven, Michael. "Cognitive Moral Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 56:689-94; June 1975.
119. _____. "Student Values as Educational Objectives." *Proceedings of the 1965 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1966. pp. 33-49.
120. Selman, Robert L. "Relation of Role-Taking to the Development of Moral Judgement in Children." *Child Development* 42:79-91; 1971.
121. _____, and Lieberman, Marcus. "Primary Level Curriculum: Cognitive-Developmental Theory of Moral Reasoning." *Values, Feelings and Morals: Part I–Research and Perspectives*. (Edited by D. Dwain Hearn.) Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators, 1974. pp. 70-85.
122. Shaftel, Fannie R., and Shaftel, George. *Role-Playing for Social Values: Decision-Making in the Social Studies*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
123. Simon, Sidney B. *Meeting Yourself Halfway*. Niles, Illinois: Argus Communications, 1974.
124. _____, and Clark, Jay. *Beginning Values Clarification: Strategies for the Classroom*. San Diego: Pennant Educational Publications, 1974.
125. _____, and deSherbinnin, Polly. "Values Clarification: It Can Start Gently and Grow Deep." *Phi Delta Kappan* 56:679-83; June 1975.
126. _____; Hawley, Robert C.; and Britton, David D. *Composition for Personal Growth: Values Clarification Through Writing*. New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
127. _____; Howe, Leland W.; and Kirschenbaum, Howard. *Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students*. New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.
128. Simpson, Elizabeth. "Moral Development Research: A Case Study of Scientific Cultural Bias." *Human Development* 17:81-106; June 1974.
129. Sizer, Theodore R., editor. *Religion and the Public Schools*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.
130. _____, and Sizer, Nancy F., editors. *Moral Education: Five Lectures*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.
131. Skinner, B. F. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. N.Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.
132. Smith, B. Othanel. "Teaching and Testing Values." *Proceedings of the 1965 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1966. pp. 50-59.
133. Stewart, John S. "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique." *Phi Delta Kappan* 56:684-88; June 1975.

134. Stone, Norma K. "The Development of Moral Thought in Children." *Values, Feelings and Morals: Part I–Research and Perspectives*. (Edited by D. Dwain Hearn.) Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators, 1974. pp. 5-18.
135. Sugarman, Barry. "Moral Education and the Social Structure of the School." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 1:47-67; 1968.
136. _____. *The School and Moral Development*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1973.
137. Sullivan, Edmund V. *Moral Learning: Findings, Issues, and Questions*. New York: Paulist Press, 1975.
138. _____; McCullough, George; and Stager, Mary. "A Developmental Study of the Relationship Between Conceptual, Ego, and Moral Development." *Child Development* 41:399-411; June 1970.
139. Tapp, June L. "A Child's Garden of Law and Order." *Law in American Society* 2:13-16; May 1973.
140. Taylor, Marvin J. *Religious and Moral Education*. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.
141. Turiel, E. "Developmental Process in the Child's Moral Thinking." *Trends and Issues in Developmental Psychology*. (Edited by P. Mussen and others.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
142. _____. "An Experimental Test of the Sequentiality of Developmental Stages in the Child's Moral Judgment." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 3:611-18; 1966.
143. Weaver, V. Phillips. "Moral Education and the Study of United States History." *Social Education* 39:36-39; January 1975.
144. Williams, N., and Williams, S. *The Moral Development of Children*. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
145. Wilson, John. *Moral Education and the Curriculum*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1969.
146. _____; Williams, Norman; and Sugarman, Barry. *Introduction to Moral Education*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967.
147. Wright, D. *The Psychology of Moral Behavior*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1971.
148. Yankelovich, Daniel. *Changing Youth Values in the 70's: A Study of American Youth*. John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund, Inc., 1974.

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Allport, Gordon W. *Nature of Prejudice*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1954. 537 pp.

Dewey, John. *Individualism, Old and New*. New York: Minton, Balch and Company, 1930. 171 pp.

Erikson, Erik H. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1968. 336 pp.

Foot, Phillipa, editor. *Theories of Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967. 188 pp.

Fromm, Erich. *The Sane Society*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955. 370 pp.

Gantt, Christopher. "Juvenile Delinquency and its Prime Cause." New York: American Press, 1964. 24 pp.

Heafford, Michael. *Pestalozzi: His Thought and Its Relevance Today*. London: Methuen & Company, Ltd., 1967. 100 pp.

Jung, C.G. *The Undiscovered Self*. (Translated from the German by R.F.C. Hull.) Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1957. 113 pp.

Kroeber, Theodora. *Ishi in Two Worlds: A Biography of the Last Wild Indian in North America*. Berkely: University of California, Press, 1961. 255 pp.

Leeper, Robert R., editor. *Emerging Moral Dimensions in Society: Implications for Schooling*. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum, 1975. 70 pp.

Lockwood, Alan L. *Moral Reasoning: The Value of Life*. Columbus, Ohio: Xerox Education Publications, 1972.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Crime and Custom in Savage Society*. Paterson, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1959. 132 pp.

Maslow, Abraham H. *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*. New York: The Viking Press, 1971. 423 pp.

Moustakas, Clark. *Creativity and Conformity*. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1967. 142 pp.

Peters, R. S. *Authority, Responsibility, and Education*. New York: Atherton Press, 1966. 137 pp.

Phenix, Philip H. *Education and the Common Good: A Moral Philosophy of the Curriculum*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1961. 271 pp.

Riesman, David. *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962. 386 pp.

Russell, Bertrand. *Education and the Good Life*. New York: Boni & Liveright, 1926. 319 pp.

Waller, Willard. *The Sociology of Teaching*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1961. 467 pp.